



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,066	07/14/2006	Anthony Renfrew White	CUL0022U\$	3252
23413	7590	12/04/2009		EXAMINER
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP				WALTERS, JOHN DANIEL
20 Church Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
22nd Floor				3618
Hartford, CT 06103				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/04/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/586,066	Applicant(s) WHITE, ANTHONY RENFREW
	Examiner JOHN D. WALTERS	Art Unit 3618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12,14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-12,14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 August 2009 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20090930
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 - 12, 14 and 16 - 20 have been examined. Claims 13 and 15 have been canceled by Applicant.

The indicated allowability of claim 20 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Senour (3,993,166). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 - 6, 8 - 12, 14, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wurn (3,055,523) in view of Hamilton, Jr. (2,653,679) and Vervaeke (BE 1012085A6). Wurn discloses an extension hand truck comprising:

- a hand truck for transporting a load (Fig. 1);
- a sub-frame with a foot portion (Figs. 1 and 2, item 1);
- a main frame engaged with said sub frame (Figs. 1 and 2 , item 2);
- said sub-frame being capable of being extended and retracted with respect to a lower end of said main frame (Fig. 5);
- at least one wheel secured to said main frame (Figs. 1 and 2, item 16);

- a flexible linkage connecting said main frame and said sub frame with a power source (Fig. 1, item 30);
- one end of said flexible linkage being secured to said main frame and another end of said linkage being secured to said sub-frame (Fig. 1);
- said sub-frame including a pair of side rails and at least one cross member (Fig. 1, items 1 and 4);
- said sub-frame including an extension which is selectively extendable (Fig. 5);
- said main frame including a pair of side rails and at least one cross member (Fig 1, items 2 and 41);
- a handle (Fig. 1, item 57);
- said sub-frame being telescopically received by said main frame (Figs. 5 and 6).

Wurn does not disclose the use of a motor for providing power to said hand truck. Hamilton, however, discloses an automatic leveling mechanism for a hoisting truck comprising:

- an electric motor (Fig. 11, item 13);
- a controller, including a switch, coupled to said motor for enable control by a user (column 7, lines 34 - 46);
- a gear box driven by said motor (Fig. 1, item 9);
- a flexible linkage being a roller chain (Fig. 1, item 8);

- said flexible member being trained around a rotatable member, i.e. sprocket, driven by said motor and trained around another rotatable member secured relative to said sub-frame (Fig. 2, items 7 and 9);
- safety switches operable to control said motor to prevent extension or retraction of a sub-frame (column 4, lines 15 - 46).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to combine the hand truck of Wurn with the drive mechanism of Hamilton in order to provide a user with a manual control of a load support (Hamilton column 2, lines 28 - 30).

Wurn in view of Hamilton does not disclose a foot portion the raises and lowers relative to a wheel. Vervaeke, however, discloses a hand truck comprising:

- a foot portion (Fig. 1, item 9);
- said foot portion being configured to lower and elevate relative to a wheel (Figs. 2 and 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to combine the teaching of foot movement of Vervaeke with the hand truck of Wurn in view of Hamilton in order to provide improved flexibility for loading and moving a load. This would allow a user to elevate said load as well as extract said load from a location lower than said hand truck.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wurn in view of Hamilton and Vervaeke as applied to claims 1 - 6, 8 - 12, 14, 16 and 18 above,

and further in view of Wetzel. Wurn in view of Hamilton and Vervaeke does not disclose the use of wheel brakes. Wetzel, however, discloses a breakable hand truck comprising:

- selectively engagable wheel brakes (Fig. 2, item 38).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to combine the hand truck of Wurn in view of Hamilton and Vervaeke with the brake system of Wetzel in order to provide an ample braking force (Wetzel column 3, lines 11 - 13) which would provide a user with increased vehicle control.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wurn in view of Hamilton and Vervaeke as applied to claims 1 - 6, 8 - 12, 14, 16 and 18 above, and further in view of Tolly (6,457,727). Wurn in view of Hamilton and Vervaeke does not disclose the use of a slack reduction mechanism. Tolly, however, discloses a hand truck comprising:

- a spring capable of taking up slack in a flexible linkage (Figs. 1, 5 and 6, item 116).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to combine the hand truck of Wurn in view of Hamilton and Vervaeke with the spring of Tolly in order to provide a help prevent a load platform from

transitioning too quickly and dangerously when a load is imposed or removed (Tolly column 1, lines 46 - 49).

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wurn in view of Hamilton and Vervaeke as applied to claims 1 - 6, 8 - 12, 14, 16 and 18 above, and further in view of Senour (3,993,166). Wurn in view of Hamilton and Vervaeke does not disclose the use of a weight sensor. Senour, however, discloses an overload signaling system comprising:

- a weight sensor (Fig. 1, item 5c and column 4, lines 11 - 19);
- a safety switch operable by said weight sensor to prevent a lift mechanism from extending and retracting (Fig. 1, item 4 and column 2, lines 12 - 16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to combine the hand truck of Wurn in view of Hamilton and Vervaeke with the weight sensor of Senour in order to provide a weight based fail-safe system for a lifting device. This increases user safety and decreases possibility of catastrophic component failure.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 12, 14 and 16 - 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOHN D. WALTERS whose telephone number is (571)272-8269. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dickson Paul can be reached on (571) 272-7742. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John D. Walters
Examiner
Art Unit 3618

/J. D. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 3618

/Paul N. Dickson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3616